



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/616,531	07/14/2000	Jeffrey Alnwick	MS-579-A	6304

7590 04/28/2005
Bernard Malina Esq
Malina & Wolson
60 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10165-0501

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CUONG H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3661

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/616,531

Applicant(s)

ALNWICK, JEFFREY

Examiner

CUONG H. NGUYEN

Art Unit

3661

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-16, 24, 26-35, 37-41 and 43-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 13-16, 24, 26-35, 37-41 and 43-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is the answer to the communication received on 8/02/2004 (the Response TO ELECTION/RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT).

Status of the Claims

2. Claims 1-48 are pending in this application. Claims 1-11, 13-16, 24, 26-35, and 37-40 are elected on 4/02/2004.
43-46

Drawings

3. This application has been filed with 4 pages of 4 formal drawings which currently are acceptable for examining purposes.

Response:

4. The examiner regrets for saying in the Office Action mailed on 9/08/2003 that "Independent claims 1-8, 15, 17-21, are patentable distinct over closest previous patents of Orgram (US Pat. 5,822,737), Call, US Pat. 6,154,738, and Deaton et al. (US Pat. 6,516,3020), or <http://www.amazon.com>", the examiner's supervisor suggests new combination of prior art that suggests invention's concept.

The examiner respectfully submits that a new ground of rejection is applied for claims 1-8, 15, and 17-21, because claiming that: "shipment a product to a client (i.e., an end-user) of a customer (e.g., amazon.com), comprising a blind packaging slip provided with a return address of the customer (e.g., amazon.com)" reads on Hartman et al.'s teachings (i.e., amazon.com) many "middle-men" do similar things on the Internet for keeping a secret to the end user about where end user's items come from – if reveal, end users can purchase their items directly/cheaper from a revealed manufacturer); e.g., amazon.com ships a SONY TV to a client with a packaging slip provided with a return

address of amazon.com instead of a SONY's local representative; here, "a blind packaging slip" is merely a form with specific address of a orderer/customer (i.e., amazon.com), including this form in the shipment of that SONY TV does not make it inventive because it has been known to send along a product an envelope with a returned address to a seller, except "if use" the return address would be amazon.com, if not use, it is just an extra printed paper. Again, the including this "blind packaging slip" in a shipment is not an inventive concept; at least 4 US Patents obviously teach that analogous concept (see US Pats. 6,594,641; 6,535,294; 6,233,565; 6,754,637, and US Pat. 6,587,827).

- Also 6,748,366 has "protecting anonymity" in the title.
- US Pat. 6,594,641- Allows customers to purchase directly from the wholesaler, and yet still uses their local retailer.
- US Pat. 6,535,294- Prints labels with retailers logo. It teaches that if the wholesaler were to remain anonymous that the packing slip with the shipped item would not have the wholesalers information.

From the objects of the invention as showed below; the applicant defines about "a blind packaging slip" - a "printed" relationship between a end-user and "an anonymous wholesaler"; in other word, an address of a middle-man (amazon.com) is printed on that packaging slip (instead of a SONY plant):

"(19) The present invention enables an end-user to communicate directly with an anonymous wholesaler in preparing and ordering a customized printed product, thereby eliminating involvement of the retailer from the preparation of the customized printed products, while presenting an appearance to the end-user that it is the retailer, and not the wholesaler, with whom the end-user is communicating.

(20) It is an object of the present invention to provide a system and method for preparing customized printed products. Even further, it is an object of the present invention to provide a system and method for preparing customized printed products, wherein an end-user thereof uses a quasi-public communication network, such as the Internet, to communicate directly with a print shop, thereby providing an expedited method for preparing the customized printed products."

Please note that the "most detailed" claims 1, and 33 involve only 2 parties: a customer (e.g., amazon.com), and a supplier (e.g., a SONY manufacturing representative) – a client (end-user) of the customer (e.g., amazon.com)/client is mentioned in these claims but does not contribute to these claims' limitations; therefore, including a packaging slip with the return address of a customer (e.g., amazon.com)/client is a very old practice. Independent claims 17, and 41 analogously describe similar positions wherein a client is an end-user, and a customer is amazon.com.

Claim Objection

5. Claim 1 is objected for a typo error on line 10, "blink" should be – blind --.
Correction is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6A. Claim 26 recites the limitation "...in accordance with Claim 22" in line 1 of claim 26 (Amdt. Dated March 8, 2004). It is unclear since claim 22 was canceled on page 6 of this amendment.

6B. Claim 33 recites the limitation "...ordering means provided on said website for allowing the customer to said particular item" in lines 7-8 of claim 33 (Amdt. dated

March 8, 2004). It should be replaced with -- ordering means provided on said website for allowing the customer to order said particular item --.

6C. The remaining claims 27, 29-30, 34-35, 37-38, and 40 are rejected for incorporating the above defects from their respective parent claims 26, and 33.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-3, 9-10, 13-14, 17-19, 24, 26-27, 33-34, 37-38, 41, and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al. (US Pat. 5,960,411) , in view of Deaton et al. (US Pat. 6,516,302), in view of Ikeda et al., (US Pat. 5,937,391),-and further in view of Ogram, (US pat. 5,822,737) .

A. Re. to independent claim 33: Hartman et al. teach:

A system for enabling a customer to order items from a supplier over the Internet for shipment to client of the customer (see Hartman et al., 1:6-8), comprising:

- a website operated by an administrator allowing the customer to request availability of a particular component from the supplier and to display on a computer screen the availability status of said particular item to the customer, said availability status including the price of said particular item (see Hartman et al., the abstract);
- ordering means provided on said website for allowing the customer to order said particular item (see Hartman et al., the abstract); and

- processing means associated with said website operating on a real-time basis for reserving said particular item for the customer, (i.e., Hartman et al.'s server can prevent a second customer from ordering said particular item when the inventory of said particular item has been completely depleted – see Hartman et al., Fig.5 ref. 501 wherein a query for item's availability is prompt, and because the computer system updates purchasing information in real-time, a response for ref. 501 is available to a customer - see Hartman et al., 2:39-43).

Hartman et al., do not expressly disclose a bonus program means included on said website for providing an incentive to the customer for ordering from the supplier, said bonus program means including a graphical representation of a sales target/threshold, and a current sales total, said current sales total approaching said sales target total in said graphical representation as additional items are ordered.

However, Deaton et al. suggest about a bonus program as an incentive to customer's purchases (see Deaton et al., the abstract, and 1:29 to 2:25). The examiner submits that merely making that bonus indicative "visible" to a customer by showing a graphical representation of a sales target total and current sales total are obvious from Deaton et al.'s "visual display" (see Deaton et al., Fig.21, ref.970).

Hartman et al., and Deaton et al. do not disclose about comparing a total of purchase with said threshold for an award.

However, Ikeda also compare a purchase point/amount with a target total to decide a bonus/discount/reward (see Ikeda et al., 8:48-59). Ikeda also disclose "and rewarding the customer (rewarding the customer when said current sales total equals said

sales target total (e.g., see Ikeda et al., US Pat. 5,937,391, claim 27 and 1:11-17, “*wherein a customer is provided a coupon/gift corresponding to a sales amount/a predetermined value.*”

The examiner respectfully submits that a bonus program suggested by Deaton et al. would make a comparison when a sale total equals or exceeds a sales target total; and a graphical representation indicating of a bonus level could be a bar graph for comparisons since viewers would understand these visible/visualized indications.

Hartman et al., and Deaton et al. do not disclose about including a shipping means provided on said website for shipping said particular item ordered including a packing slip provided with the return address of the customer.

However, Ogram teaches that idea (see Ogram, claim 8) wherein a return address of the customer/client is used for a transaction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the above teachings of Hartman et al., Deaton et al., Ikeda et al., and Ogram because they all in the same field of endeavor (buying/selling in Internet), their motivations are to increase sales by giving out bonuses/rewards to customers to promote more businesses for their online services.

B. Re. to claims 1, 9-10, 17, 24, 41, and 34: The examiner submits that they contain similar/or lesser features of rejected claim 33; therefore, the rationales and references set forth to reject claim 33 are applied to reject those claims for obviousness on 35 USC 103(a).

C. Re. to dependent claims 2-3, 13-14, 18-19, 26-27, 37-38, and 43-44: The rationales and references for above rejection of claim 1 are incorporated.

Deaton et al. also use manufacture's reference number (MFG. P/N) to search for a product from a database (see Deaton et al., 93:15-26).

The examiner respectfully submits that to search an item using a manufacturer's reference number is old and well-known (e.g., searching a Hewlett-Packard monitor with a manufacturer's reference number "hp pavilion mx70" or only using "mx70" would give very narrow related hits from the Internet to that specific meanings).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a manufacturing reference number for searching in Hartman et al., Deaton et al., Ikeda et al., and Ogram, because this increases accuracy and saving time in order to get a close hit from the Internet.

8. Claims 4-6 and 28-30, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al. (US Pat. 5,960,411) , in view of Deaton et al. (US Pat. 6,516,302), in view of Ikeda et al., (US Pat. 5,937,391), and further in view of Ogram, (US pat. 5,822,737).

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 2 are incorporated.

They are "system" claims, including a customer log-in means (e.g., using a computer keyboard) for allowing a customer to log-in at a particular point in a searching means if a customer lost an initial connection with a website (e.g., <http://www.amazon.com>). The examiner respectfully submits that this feature is analogously represented in listening to a last used radio channel WTOP 107.7 FM, one only needs to turn it on and it was automatically programmed in its chip software to start at the same place it was used before turning off the power; this feature is also similar to a TV – starting from the same channel when you turn off that TV).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement above idea in Hartman et al., Deaton et al., Ikeda et al.,

and Ogram, because it increases conveniences, friendly to a user, and saving time for selecting a step if power was turning off.

9. Claims 7-8, 20-21, 31-32, and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al. (US Pat. 5,960,411) , in view of Deaton et al. (US Pat. 6,516,302), in view of Ikeda et al., (US Pat. 5,937,391), and further in view of Ogram, (US pat. 5,822,737).

The rationales and references for rejection of claim 2 are incorporated.

The examiner respectfully submits that e-commerce business: a negotiating means (e.g., this means is used in online bidding on <http://www.ebay.com> in bidding a price of an auction item, or US Pat. 5,862,223 to Walker et al.), and a means for tracking the status of an order (e.g., <http://www.amazon.com> having a means for tracking shipment for customer orders, for a package is in transit .etc.).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement above bidding, and tracking ideas with Hartman et al. (amazon.com's business practice), Deaton et al., Ikeda et al., and Ogram, because these make the e-commerce practice becomes flexible, increases conveniences, and saving time to customers.

10. Claims 11, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al. (US Pat. 5,960,411) , in view of Deaton et al. (US Pat. 6,516,302), in view of Ikeda et al., (US Pat. 5,937,391), in view of Ogram, (US pat. 5,822,737) and further in view of Microsoft Excel software.

The rationales and reference for rejection of claim 41 are incorporated.

Microsoft Excel, an old and well-known presentation software that used comparison data to create bar graphs reflecting input data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartman et al. (amazon.com's business practice), Deaton et al., Ikeda et al., and Ogram, with the application of MS Excel software to

create bar graphs reflecting sales total and sales target total. The motivation for this is using vivid, understandable graphical representations to viewers for showing clear comparisons.

11. Claims 15-16, and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman et al., Deaton et al., Ikeda et al., Ogram, and further in view of Beldock (US Pat. 6,490,565).

A. Re. to claims 15, and 40: The system in accordance with Claim 33 further including a display of said website provided with an industry certification mark for the supplier.

The rationales and reference for rejection of claim 33 are incorporated.

Hartman et al., Deaton et al., Ikeda et al., and Ogram do not disclose about displaying a website provided with an industry certification mark for the supplier.

However, Beldock (see 1:7-12) teaches about an industry certification mark. The examiner submits that this idea can be used to label/mark a standardized certified website for easy tracking.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartman et al., Deaton et al., Ikeda et al., and Ogram, with Beldock. The motivation for this is increasing a favorable consideration from users because this would make a user puts more appealing from a trust-worthy source by showing an industry certification mark on its website.

B. Re. to claims 16, 39: Although they are “system” claims, including a similar limitation of “including a display of said website provided with an industry certification mark for the supplier”. The examiner submits that it contains obvious features as in

claim 40; therefore, the rationales and references set forth are applied to reject claims 16, 39 on 35 USC 103(a).

Allowable Subject Matter

12. The indicated allowability of claims 1-8, 15, and 17-21 are withdrawn in view of the above newly discovered reference(s). Rejections based on those newly cited references are set forth.

Conclusion

13. Pending claims are not patentable.

14. The attached prior art are pertinent to claimed subject matter of this pending application.

- Orgram (US Pat. 5,822,737 – 10/13/1998, class. 705/26), teaches a financial transaction system wherein a concept of “selected return address” in shipping is claimed (see claims 8-9, 18).

- amazon.com, Inc., (amazon.com, inc. have been practiced the followings in its <http://www.amazon.com> since 1996) this website business practice was from concepts of **Jeffrey Bezos** et al. in US Pats. 6,606,608; 6,525,747; 6,029,141; 5,960,411; 5,727,163; 5,715,399.

- Deaton et al. (US Pat. 6,516,302 – 2/04/2003), teach a method and system for accumulating marginal discounts and applying an associated incentive upon achieving one of a plurality of thresholds.

- **Call**, US Pat. **6,154,738**) “Detailed Description Text (145):

The shipping module 504 is also conventional, and handles outbound shipments, accepts new customer shipping and billing address information, handles partial shipments by

identifying items reserved for later shipment, and prints packing slips and bills of lading.

This concept of “packing slip” is different from “blind-packaging slip” of the pending application wherein in shipments a purchase order, the package is shipped directly to a client of a customer with the customer’s name and return address on the package and not the address of the supplier or the original equipment manufacturer.

- Perkowski, (US Pat.6,064,979 – 5/16/2000), teaches a method of and a system for finding and serving consumer product related information over the internet using manufacturer identification numbers; this patent discloses about searching an item using a manufacturer’s reference number.

- ALNWICK, J. DERWENT-ACC-NO: 2002-130669 (WO 200195205A1 December 11, 2000 ,INT-CL (IPC): G06 F 17/60), Items ordering system through Internet e.g. for computer components, provides website which displays available status of particular item and price of particular item.

- PFEIFFER, F; ROSENBAUM, W , DERWENT-ACC-NO: 1999-612182 (priority 3/13/1998), Processing of items to be returned to sender - video codes only one image of postal item belonging to group of items having specific degree of similarity in address area of image and assigns rest of group to identified sender

WO 200010113 A1, February 24, 2000, G09F 3/02

15. Google’s definition:

Private Label Delivery : A shipping service that uses *your company's personalized labels* and omits Tech Data's name from the packing slip. Your customer receives a package that appears to have come directly from your own warehouse. Compare with Blind Packaging

Blind Packaging: A free shipping service that uses *plain labels* and omits Tech Data's name from the packing slip. Your customer receives a package that appears to have come directly from your own warehouse. Compare with Private Label Delivery

16. Remarks: A method for enabling a customer to order items from a supplier over the Internet for shipment to a client of the customer is also taught by **Walker** et al., US Pat. 6,249,772 - 3:56 to 4:6 "Another arena where technology has improved the retail process is that of reservation-type businesses typically practiced by distributed chains or franchises. Such businesses include, for example, hotels and automobile rental companies. A customer wishing, for example, to make a reservation at a Hyatt hotel may contact a central Hyatt authority, or a local Hyatt hotel. A price is determined, and the inventory records of both the Hyatt authority and the local Hyatt hotel are updated to reflect the reservation. Technology including the Internet and other computer network and communications systems functions to increase user access to the goods and services, and to improve inter-company processes and communications. Such business models permit a central authority such as a franchiser to have some affect on customer pricing. However, these business models represent 'closed' systems where product and services prices are agreed upon and limited to application within the particular franchise arrangement or company.", and Walker et al., US Pat. 6,249,772 - 7:39-40 "FIG. 7 illustrates a database table for storing reservation data maintained by the credit card processor depicted in FIG. 4;" or 10:35 to 11:6 "In addition to the notion of selecting goods and products and establishing prices for the same online, system 100 allows for local store inventory checking and inventory reservations so that a customer knows and is assured that he may acquire a particular product for which he received a price online. Accordingly, after a

consumer negotiates a price for a selected product, the consumer is assured that he will actually receive the product when he goes to a selected retailer to acquire that product. As such, system 100 can allow a hold or reservation to be made to reserve an inventory item at a local store. Such reservations of goods can occur by having central controller 110 send a message to the selected local store that causes the local store to place a hold on the inventory item. Such a message is preferably sent electronically in the form of a database instruction and, in particular, an automatic communication that causes the local store's database management and computer data processing system to create a reservation hold record in an appropriate database to reference a reserved product. For example, electronic data interchange (EDI) messages may be used to communicate inventory holds and reservations. Additionally, an automated voice messaging system could be configured to be operated by central controller 110 to cause a voice-based message to be sent to an attendant, possibly an automated attendant, for appropriate routing and inventory holding. As such, by causing a reservation to be made via some form of communication between central controller 110 and a local store, a user can be assured that his product will be set aside for his purchase and pickup. The actual process of reserving an inventory item can occur by setting a flag in an appropriate database management system that corresponds to a particular inventory item that is maintained by a local store's data processing system. The setting of flags and the recordation of data items and controls necessary to indicate a state relative to a particular field in a database management system will be readily understood by those skilled in the art of computer programming and, in particular, database management systems.”); determining a sales target total price; calculating a current sales total of the customer; graphically representing said current sales total with

respect to said sales target total; and rewarding the customer (rewarding the customer when said current sales total equals said sales target total (e.g., see **Ikeda** et al., US Pat. 5,937,391, claim 27 and 1:11- 17, “One of the most popular customer lock-in systems and sales promotion systems in shopping malls is a stamp service system. A stamp service is provided by issuing a coupon corresponding to a sales amount and presenting a customer with an awarding gift, etc. when the number of coupons reaches a predetermined value.”, or see **Walker** et al., US Pat. 6,249,772 1:57 to 2:7 “Thus, while a manufacturer is constantly striving towards his own goals, for example to sell more products, improve current products, develop new products, or distribute newly developed and manufactured goods, he has been consistently lacking in one of the key tools most effective in obtaining these goals--the customer pricing of his product. Not only does a manufacturer lack control over retail pricing, but his channel often uses their control over pricing to directly conflicting ends. A manufacturer, for example, may be lowering a distribution price to motivate the sale of an expiring product line, while the retailers are maintaining high customer prices to maximize profit. Such an artificially high retail price could subsequently result in a glut of highly discounted, left over old product that is in direct competition with the subsequently introduced new product. In fact, a typical retailer carries brands from competing manufacturers, and thus may work against one manufacturer in favor of a direct competitor.”, or **Walker** et al., US Pat. 6,249,772 2:17- 24 “Another attempt to exert control over retail pricing is seen in manufacturers' efforts to manipulate customer price through the use of paper discount coupons. In theory, such coupons permit a manufacturer to affect the final net price to the buyer, thereby affecting the sale of selected products. Again in theory, such coupons can not only target selected

products, but geographic regions and even, through appropriate distribution of the coupons, selected customers"). The above examples suggest a comparison when a sales total equals a sales target total.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CUONG H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-272-6759. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 am - 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, THOMAS G. BLACK can be reached on 571-272-6956. The Rightfax number for the organization where this application is assigned is 571-273-6759.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cuong H. Nguyen

CHAN
CUONG H. NGUYEN
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3661